AMENDMENT 220 - REPEAL THE VOLUMETRIC ETHANOL EXCISE TAX CREDIT (VEETC) AND SAVE \$6 BILLION

Congress has subsidized domestic ethanol production and, in fact, guaranteed a market for the product for nearly four decades. Federal assistance ranges from tax credits, grants, loans, loan guarantees, to federally-directed markets (E15), and a federal minimum usage mandate (Renewable Fuel Standard)—a primary reason GAO called the VEETC duplicative in its recent report.

While born of good intentions, federal subsidies for ethanol have failed to achieve their intended goals of energy independence

In fact, federal subsidies created an ethanol surplus in 2010, leading the U.S. to become a net *exporter* of ethanol—397 million gallons in 2010 and 917 million gallons since 2005.

The VEETC alone costs taxpayers approximately **\$6 billion** annually; cumulative foregone federal tax revenue since its inception in 2005 reached **\$24 billion** at the end of 2010; if left intact through 2011 (when it is scheduled to expire), it will have cost taxpayers **\$30.5 billion** over its lifetime

Consumers pay \$1.78 per gallon of subsidized ethanol-blended fuel. Meanwhile, U.S. biofuels consumption remains a small share of national transportation fuel use—7.5 percent in 2012 and 7.6 percent in 2030

Ethanol burns at two-thirds the efficiency of gasoline (**68 percent** of the energy content of gasoline), ultimately increasing fuel consumption nationally as drivers and boaters are forced to burn more fuel to travel the same distances.

Increases of corn used for fuel production puts pressure on corn prices, demand for cropland, and the price of animal feed. Those effects, in turn, have raised the price of many farm commodities (such as soybeans, meat, poultry, and dairy products) and, consequently, the retail price of food—USDA estimates **40 percent** of last year's corn crop will be used for ethanol production

Auto and marine engine producers and consumers have long heralded engine damage caused by ethanol use. The demise of engines means the demand for more, ultimately causing increased demand for engines and, therefore, fuel consumption in the manufacturing supply chains involving engine production

REPEAL THE VOLUMETRIC ETHANOL EXCISE TAX CREDIT (VEETC)

Federal support for ethanol production began in the 1970s, largely for the purpose of achieving energy independence

A wide range of federal assistance has been established in piecemeal since that time

Nearly four decades after federal ethanol policy began, our nation remains largely dependent on foreign sources of oil

The Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit (VEETC) went into effect in 2005 and provides .45 cents per gallon tax credit to blenders of ethanol in fuel. Primary recipients include integrated oil companies, such as BP, Exxon, Chevron, etc.

In GAO's recent study, it found the VEETC is duplicative, because it pays blenders to do something already required by law under the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS).¹

Now the VEETC only functions to incentivize the consumption of fuel.² The effect is to encourage blenders to blend ethanol *beyond* what is mandated, resulting in a supply glut. The ethanol industry is producing over **13.5 billion gallons annually**, despite the Renewable Fuels Standard mandating only **12.6 billion gallons in 2011**

As a result, the U.S. is now a net *exporter* of ethanol. <u>Through November of 2010, the U.S. exported **397 million gallons** of ethanol. Exports have reached **917.7 million gallons** since 2005</u>

¹GAO-11-318SP, March 2011, http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11318sp.pdf

² Randy Schnepf, Redundancy of ethanol blender's tax credit when coupled with usage mandate, Congressional Research Service MEMO, July 13, 2010.

Exporting a fuel does *not* help our country achieve energy security...although it may help Europe in this respect.

Even the ethanol industry admits The VEETC is nearly irrelevant³

FEDERAL ETHANOL SUBSIDIES POSE SIGNIFICANT COSTS ON AMERICANS AS TAXPAYERS AND CONSUMERS

At the same time, the VEETC costs taxpayers **\$6 billion annually (**GAO's recent report estimates \$5.7 billion annually.) Since the VEETC is available in unlimited quantities, its cost varies every year The VEETC's cumulative foregone tax revenue since its inception in 2005 reached **\$24 billion** at the end of 2010.

If left intact through 2011 (when it is scheduled to expire), it will have cost taxpayers **\$30.5 billion** over its lifetime.

CBO found consumers pay **\$1.78** in ethanol subsidies before they even pay at the pump

Meanwhile, U.S. biofuels consumption remains a small share of national transportation fuel use—**7.5 percent in 2012 and 7.6 percent in 2030**⁴

Not only is VEETC a failed policy, it is a **prime example of what happens when politicians pick winners and losers** and preempt the free markets determination of the most efficient and cost-effective technologies

Ethanol results in a major increase in overall fuel consumption Foremost, ethanol is a third less efficient than gasoline (burns at 68 percent the energy content of gasoline)⁵

By EPA's own admission, ethanol reduces fuel economy.

This will have the effect of increased fuel consumption as drivers will be forced to fill their tanks more frequently to travel the same distances

³ Sasha Lyutse, "Top U.S. Oil Refiner Says Corn Ethanol Tax Credit is Unnecessary," Switchboard, Natural Resources Defense Council Staff Blog, July 27, 2010, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/slyutse/top_us_oil_refiner_says_corn_e.html

⁴ http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/aeo/otheranalysis/bts.html

The Congressional Budget Office, Using Biofuel Tax Credits to Achieve Energy and Environmental Policy Goals, July 2010, http://www.cbo.gov/doc.cfm?index=11477

Consumers will burn more fuel (and pay more) to drive to the grocery store for products likely more expensive due to the diversion of the U.S. corn crop for ethanol.

Federal subsidies for ethanol put more pressure on the U.S. corn crop

Ethanol production has contributed to the increased price of corn as well as all feed grains, land, and other input costs.⁶

Corn competes with the major grains globally as a feedstock.

Corn is the primary feed grain in the United States, accounting for over 90 percent of total feed and production use

Reports vary, but estimates on corn crop diverted for ethanol production ranges from 32 percent to 40 percent with all estimates projected to increase

Corn prices recently passed **\$7 per bushel**, surpassing their highest level since 2008, putting pressure on consumers.

USDA's 2011 prospective plantings report due out at the end of March is expected to forecast **92 million acres of corn planting in the U.S**. This is compared to 78 million acres for soybeans, 57 million acres for wheat, 12.75 million acres for cotton, and 2.88 million acres for rice.

According To Cbo:⁷

"The increased use of ethanol accounted for about 10 percent to 15 percent of the rise in food prices between April 2007 and April 2008. In turn, that increase will boost federal spending for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as the Food Stamp program) and other child nutrition programs by an estimated \$600 million to \$900 million in FY 2009." These domestic nutrition programs comprise over 60 percent of the farm bill

⁶ Using Biofuel Tax Credits to Achieve Energy and Environmental Policy Goals, Congressional Budget Office, July 2010, http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/114xx/doc11477/07-14-Biofuels.pdf; R41282, Congressional Research Service, June 11, 2010, http://www.crs.gov/Products/R/PDF/R41282.pdf

⁷CBO, The Impact of Ethanol Use on Food Prices and Greenhouse-Gas Emissions, April 2009 http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/100xx/doc10057/04-08-Ethanol.pdf

This has a ripple effect that is getting groups like the Grocery Manufacturers Association and the Restaurant Associations to oppose because of its impact on food prices.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations recently reported global food production must rise 70 percent by 2050 to keep pace with the global population as it is expected to rise to 9.1 billion.⁸

Emira Woods, Chairperson of *Africa Action* said, "In the midst of a global food crisis and rising hunger, the ethanol industry expropriates land in Africa and elsewhere to grow food that fuels cars. We applaud Senators Coburn and Cardin for introducing legislation to end this shameless subsidy."

Motorists and machine operators have long protested mechanical problems associated with burning ethanol-blended fuel

Mandated ethanol use ultimately shortens engine life cycles and increases the need for new engines.

As a consequence, additional energy consumption will be added to the loads of relevant supply chains, requiring the need for more steel (and more carbon) to build new engines as well as more fuel necessary to produce and deliver the new products to replenish the market.

In this sense, it fails to even accomplish its environmental goals.

All signs indicate the "carbon footprint," as it has been characterized by EPA, of the blend wall grows larger with every decision to increase it.

Specifically, ethanol weakens fiberglass gas tanks, fuel filters, and carburetors in marine engines. Most noticeable though is how ethanol attracts water. In a marine setting, this can be detrimental to engine life.

AAA, the nation's biggest motoring organization, said in July 2009⁹ the EPA should reject Growth Energy's request because higher blends may damage exhaust systems, engines and fuel pumps and destroy catalytic converters. General Motors Co., Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler LLC have said the

⁸Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, How to Feed the World in 2050, http://www.fao.org/wsfs/forum/2050/wsfs-forum/en/; World Food Prices Jump to Record on Sugar, Oilseeds, Bloomberg News, January 2011, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-01-05/global-food-prices-climb-to-record-on-cereal-sugar-costs-un-agency-says.html

⁹ http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-10-13/epa-allows-15-ethanol-in-gasoline-for-newer-cars.html

Obama administration should be cautious about increasing the ethanol percentage in gasoline.

There is no measurable environmental benefit either—a prime reason why groups like the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, and Environmental Working Group oppose ethanol subsidies

According to CBO:

In 2008, "the use of ethanol reduced gasoline consumption in the United States by only about 4 percent and greenhouse-gasses [for those believing in climate changes theories] from the transportation sector by less than 1 percent."

According to the New York Times: 10

Corn farming is the biggest source of pollution associated with ethanol production. Corn requires vastly more fertilizer¹¹ and pesticides than soybeans or other potential biofuel feedstocks, such as perennial grasses, according to a 2007 report from the National Academy of Sciences.¹²

"Fertilizer and pesticide runoffs from the U.S. Corn Belt are key contributors to "dead zones" in the Gulf of Mexico and along the Atlantic Coast. A 2008 study by independent researchers, published in the academy's Proceedings journal, calculated that increasing corn production to meet the 2007 renewable fuels target would add to nitrogen pollution in the Gulf of Mexico by 10 to 34 percent."

Modern ethanol plants require 3 barrels of water to produce 1 barrel of ethanol fuel

Even its former proponents now oppose ethanol:

Former President Bill Clinton suggested the diversion of the corn crop for ethanol production could lead to higher prices and even food riots

Former Vice President Al Gore recently admitted he originally supported ethanol, because of his political aspirations. He goes on to say, "It's hard

¹⁰ http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/25/business/energy-environment/25iht-rbogeth.html?src=busln&pagewanted=print

 $[\]frac{11}{\text{http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/fertilizer/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier}$

¹² http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/national_academy_of_sciences/index.html?inline=nyt-org

once such a program is put in place to deal with the lobbies that keep it going."

"Ethanol is not an ideal transportation fuel. The future of transportation fuels shouldn't involve ethanol." —*Energy Secretary Steven Chu, Nov. 29, 2010*

AMENDMENT 218 – SAVES TAXPAYERS AT LEAST \$7.3 BILLION BY TERMINATING LEFTOVER CONGRESSIONAL EARMARK ACCOUNTS.

Recently Congress passed a two-week continuing resolution, which cut \$2.7 billion in "funding that was made available in fiscal year 2010 that would have gone to earmarked programs and projects."

According to House Appropriations Committee, the earmark account funding "was automatically renewed in the CR approved by the previous Congress in December. In previous years, this funding would have gone to earmarked programs and projects."

However, according to CRS, "143 accounts have about \$7.3 billion of funding that was designated in FY 2010 for Member-only earmarks that were not reduced by H.J. Res. 44. Unless cut by future FY 2011 appropriations action, this funding (along with other Administration earmarks) would be available to the agencies...."

			Earmarks in FY2010 regular appropriations					
			All earmarks		Subset of Member- only earmarks		H.J. Res. 44 reduces funding in earmarked account by	
Bill	Department/Agency	Account a	Number	\$ million	Number	\$ million	\$ million	Comments
Transportation-HUD	Fed. Railroad Admin.	R&D	4	2.5	4	2.5		
Transportation-HUD	Fed. Transit Admin.	Research	34	1.5	34	1.5		
Transportation-HUD	Fed. Aviation Admin.	Facilities & Equipment	1	4.0	0	0.0		
Transportation-HUD Total			1,576	3,071.1	1,516	1,210.4	513.0	
Grand Total			11,320	31,953.6	9,281	10,151.3	2,768.5	

This amendment would terminate leftover congressional earmark accounts, which would save taxpayers at least \$7.3 billion.

Specifically, the amendment states, "any funds appropriated in fiscal year 2011 to any program shall be reduced by the total amount of congressional earmarks or congressionally directed spending items contained within a committee report or joint explanatory statement accompanying such an act that provided appropriations to the program in fiscal year 2010."

AMENDMENT 219 – CONSOLIDATES AT LEAST \$5 BILLION IN UNNECESSARY DUPLICATIVE AND OVERLAPPING GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.

This division would require the Office or Management and Budget (OMB) and the executive branch departments and agencies to reduce spending by at least \$5 billion through eliminating, consolidating, or streamlining government programs and agencies with duplicative and overlapping missions.

OMB would also be required to identify and report to Congress any legislative changes required to further eliminate, consolidate, or streamline government programs and agencies with duplicative and overlapping missions.

President Obama has pledged to eliminate and consolidate duplicative programs and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has issued a report just this month finding the federal government could save hundreds of billions of dollars by eliminating duplication and overlap.

The federal government wastes more than \$100 billion a year on programs with duplicative and overlapping missions, according to an analysis based upon the findings of the recent GAO report entitled "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue."

This amendment would begin to recapture just a small fraction of the amount being wasted by the federal government on duplicative and overlapping programs.

MORE THAN \$100 BILLION WASTED EVERY YEAR ON DUPLICATION AND OVERLAP

GAO's recent report only examined a fraction of the federal budget and only a handful of missions of varying scope.

GAO concluded, "considering the amount of program dollars involved in the issues we have identified, even limited adjustments could result in significant savings."

REDUCING INEFFICIENT DUPLICATION SAVES MONEY WITHOUT CUTTING ESSENTIAL SERVICES

The GAO report provides a blueprint outlining how Congress could save taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars every year without cutting essential services.

Smart consolidations will improve service.

GAO identified a number of areas where consolidation would improve services and save hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade. These include:

- DOD/VA electronic health record systems. Although the
 Departments of Defense (DOD) and Veterans Affairs (VA), for
 example, "have many common health care business needs, the
 departments have begun separate modernizations of their electronic
 health records systems. Reduced duplication in this area could save
 system development and operation costs while support higher-quality
 health care for service members and veterans."
- Multiple contracts with the same vendors for similar products. GAO found duplication among interagency and agencywide contracts across government "can result in increased procurement costs, redundant buying capacity, and in increased workload for the acquisition workforce. Some vendors stated they offer similar products and services on multiple contracts and that the effort required to be on multiple contracts resulted in extra costs to the vendor, which they pass to the government through increased prices. ... Some vendors stated the increased cost of being on multiple contracts ranged from \$10,000 to \$1,000,000 per contract due to increased bid and proposal and administrative costs."
- Underutilized and redundant but costly data centers. GAO concluded "the federal government could save \$150 billion to \$200 billion over the next decade, primarily through data center and server consolidation." GAO's analysis found "Operating and maintaining such redundant infrastructure investments was costly, inefficient, and unsustainable, and had a significant impact on energy consumption. ... Reported server utilization rates as low as 5 percent and limited

reuse of these data centers within or across agencies lends further credence to the need to restructure federal data center operations to improve efficiency and reduce costs."

OTHER EXAMPLES OF WASTEFUL DUPLICATION AND OVERLAP IDENTIFIED BY GAO

Key GAO findings and examples of duplication, mismanagement and waste:

- Dangerous lack of coordination regarding defenses against biological terror threats. At least five departments, eight agencies and more than two dozen presidential appointees oversee \$6.48 billion related to bioterrorism. GAO writes: "There is no national plan to coordinate federal, state, and local efforts following a bioterror attack, and the United States lacks the technical and operational capabilities required for an adequate response."
- \$1 trillion for special tax benefits, many of which are redundant. GAO writes: "For fiscal year 2009, the U.S. Department of the Treasury listed a total of 173 tax expenditures, some of which were the same magnitude or larger than related federal spending for some mission areas."
- Financial literacy education offered by a government with a \$14
 trillion debt. Twenty agencies operate 56 programs dedicated to
 financial literacy but GAO and agencies can't estimate what they
 cost.
- <u>Economic development programs with little evidence of economic development</u>. The federal government runs 80 economic development programs across 4 agencies at a cost of \$6.5 billion.
- Outdated highways programs. The Department of Transportation (DOT) spends \$58 billion on 100 separate programs run by five DOT agencies with 6,000 employees. GAO says the programs have "not evolved to reflect current priorities in transportation planning."

- Special treatment for catfish. GAO found that the Farm Bill assigned the United States Department of Agriculture responsibility for monitoring catfish, thus splitting seafood oversight between USDA and FDA. Fifteen federal agencies administer more than 30 food related laws.
- <u>Duplication among military branches</u>. GAO found the military wastes untold billions on duplication and overlap. For instance, Army and Air Force transportable base equipment, which includes mobile housing and dining facilities, could be used by both service, but are not.

PRESIDENT OBAMA PLEDGED TO REORGANIZE GOVERNMENT TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION IN HIS 2011 STATE OF THE UNION

In his 2011 State of the Union speech, President Obama pledged to reorganize government to eliminate duplication. He stated:

"We live and do business in the information age, but the last major reorganization of the government happened in the age of black and white TV. There are twelve different agencies that deal with exports. There are at least five different entities that deal with housing policy. Then there's my favorite example: the Interior Department is in charge of salmon while they're in fresh water, but the Commerce Department handles them in when they're in saltwater. And I hear it gets even more complicated once they're smoked. ... In the coming months, *my administration will develop a proposal to merge, consolidate, and reorganize the federal government* in a way that best serves the goal of a more competitive America." [emphasis added]

This amendment will support the President's goal by giving him the authority to begin these efforts now.

This amendment represents a very modest first step towards addressing the duplication within the federal government.

AMENDMENT 223 – SAVES TAXPAYERS \$20 MILLION BY STOPPING FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO THOSE EARNING MORE THAN \$1 MILLION.

According to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, as many as 2,840 households who have reported an income of \$1 million or more on their tax returns were paid a total of \$18.6 million in unemployment benefits in 2008. This included more than 800 earning over \$2 million and 17 with incomes exceeding \$10 million.

In all, multimillionaires were paid \$5.2 million in jobless benefits.

This amendment would end unemployment payments to jobless millionaires by stopping federal unemployment payments to those earning more than \$1 million.

This amendment would save more than \$20 million every year and more than \$100 million over the next five years as well as takes necessary steps to ensure unemployment insurance is used for its intended purpose - to provide a financial safety net for laid-off workers who are seeking reemployment.

In a federal budget rife with waste, duplication and, sometimes, sheer stupidity, giving unemployment benefits to millionaires may take the cake. Ending this practice will save nearly \$100 million and correct a gross injustice against the millions of Americans who are out of work.

The amendment is identical language to S.310, which is cosponsored by Sens. Udall (CO), Tester, and Pryor.

AMENDMENT 222 – SAVE TAXPAYERS \$550 MILLION BY ELIMINATING TAXPAYER SUBSIDIES FOR POLITICALLY CHARGED MEDIA.

FUNDING FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING HAS INCREASED

NON-PROFIT & GOVERNMENT ENTITY?

POLITICALLY BIASED

BETTER OFF IN THE LONG RUN

COMPETITION IN THE MEDIA MARKETPLACE

TAXPAYERS SHOULD NOT HAVE TO FUND POLITICALLY-CHARGED MEDIA

This amendment would eliminate the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) in for FY13 because Congress has already appropriated funds for FY12. Additionally, given the recent comments by former NPR Vice President for Fundraising, Ron Schiller, that NPR would be better of in the long without federal funding, this amendment would rescind \$100 million in CPB funds for FY12 – the approximate appropriation for NPR.

FUNDING FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING HAS INCREASED

CPB is the largest single source of funding for public media. PBS was created by CPB in 1969 and NPR was created in 1970 by the CPB. The 1,050 public broadcasting stations in America are mostly run by universities, non-profit community associations, state government agencies, and local school boards.¹³

CPB's primary job is to "receive and distribute" federal appropriations to fund national programs and public radio and television stations. Most of this funding is in the form of Community Service Grants (CSG's). CPB's direct funding levels are projected to increase from \$420 million this year, to \$445 million in FY2012. President Obama suggested increasing the

_

¹³ http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RS22168&Source=search

FY2013 level to \$460 million – a 5.7 percent increase. President Bush consistently recommended terminating CPB funding. The Current funding level is the highest it has ever been. Over the last 20 years, annual appropriations have been as low as \$250 million (FY98 & FY99). CPB also receives funding to administer digital conversions (around \$35 million per year) and a "Ready To Learn Grant" from the Department of Education (around \$30 million as well).

NPR claims only 2 percent of its funding comes from the federal government, but this statistic is misleading. For example, 41 percent of NPR funding comes from member station dues and fees it collects, ¹⁶ but many of these stations themselves receive federal funding from CBP. CBP funds more than \$90 million in grants to NPR and its member stations. ¹⁷ While most of these grants are awarded to its member stations, NPR receives 41 percent of its funding from its member stations. In other words, NPR is receiving indirect subsidies from the federal government through its member stations.

Additionally, its member stations receive 13.6 percent of their funding from universities, most of which benefit from generous federal subsidies as well. NPR also received \$8 million in direct subsidies over the last two years from the National Endowment of Arts (NEA),¹⁸ which received \$168 million last year,¹⁹ and has also received funding from the Department of Commerce and the Department of Education. In total, its member stations received \$65 million in direct appropriations last year.²⁰

PBS is similar to NPR in that while it is primarily funded through member station fees (\$200 million or 40 percent) and corporate and individual donations (\$228.6 million or 45 percent), it also receives considerable direct and indirect federal appropriations from CPB (\$53 million or 10.5 percent) and through member stations that also receive direct CPB grants.²¹

¹⁴ http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RS22168&Source=search

¹⁵ E-mail from CPB Congressional Liaison, November 4, 2010

¹⁶ http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/22/gop-puts-npr-chopping-block/?page=1

http://voices.washingtonpost.com/blog-post/2010/10/defund npr radio whos funding.html

http://www.nea.gov/Grants/recent/10grants/artv10.php

http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111 cong reports&docid=f:hr316.111.pdf

http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RS22168&Source=search

http://www.pbs.org/about/media/about/cms_page_media/29/FinancialHighlights2009forWebv8.pdf

Public Radio International (PRI) was founded in 1983 to provide some competition and alternative public radio offerings to American listeners. Like NPR, PRI is a public radio producer-distributor which broadcasts programs including *BBC World Service*, *PRI's The World*, *Bob Edwards Weekend* and *This American Life*). PRI in FY09 was directly awarded a total of \$1,603,124 in CPB discretionary funding. Additional CPB awards grant funding to public radio stations to purchases programming from NPR and PRI.

In total, around 15 percent of all public media funding comes from CPB appropriations. Over the last ten years, more than \$4 billion in federal funds have been appropriated on public radio and television.²⁴ Most of the funding is appropriated in the L-HHS appropriations bill for CPB. However, CPB, PBS, and NPR stations also receive funding from various other federal appropriation budgets, including the Department of Education.²⁵ PRI stations have also received funding from the National Science Foundation.²⁶

For example, on October 15, 2010, CPB and PBS received a "Ready-to-Learn" grant of nearly \$72 million from the Department's Office of Innovation and Improvement to "fund research, development, and deployment of transmedia content to improve the math and literacy skills of children ages 2-8."

Including non-CPB funding, from the total U.S. public broadcasting system income of \$2.85 billion, 83.6 percent came from non-federal sources (including entities such as universities that receive direct federal funding).²⁸

NON-PROFIT & GOVERNMENT ENTITY?

CPB is defined as a "private, nonprofit corporation,"²⁹ even though it is entirely funded through the federal appropriations process.³⁰ CPB's President and CEO, Patricia Harrison, was paid \$298,884 in 2009.³¹

²² http://www.pri.org/pri-facts.html

²³ E-mail from CPB Congressional Liaison, November 5, 2010

²⁴ http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RS22168&Source=search

http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RS22168&Source=search

According to a search on www.USAspending.gov, over the last ten years, \$3.9 million in grants through the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities have been awarded to PRI Foundation.

http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RS22168&Source=search

²⁸ http://www.crs.gov/pages/Reports.aspx?PRODCODE=RS22168&Source=search

http://www.cpb.org/aboutcpb/goals/goalsandobjectives/

According to NPR, it is also a not-for-profit corporation³² and CPB claims NPR is a "private, non-profit media enterprise ... funded by member stations."33 The previous CEO of NPR who fired Juan Williams, Vivian Schiller, was paid an annual salary of \$450,000.34 Her predecessor, Kenneth Stern, was paid \$1.319 million in 2008, 35 including a buyout sum of around \$900.000.36

PBS is also defined as a "private, non-profit media enterprise owned and operated by member stations." Paula Kerger, President and CEO of PBS was paid a salary of \$430,810 in 2009.³⁸

Public Radio International (PRI) was founded in 1983 as another non-profit corporation to compete with NPR for distributing public radio content. While these public broadcasting entities claim to be private non-profits and receive most of their funding from non-federal sources, more than 15 percent of their funding comes through the federal government and they benefit from having a federal entity created solely to support public broadcasting.

While it may be inappropriate to prohibit any federal funds from being appropriated to public broadcasting entities, these entities should have to at least compete with other types of media or educational forms for funding.

POLITICALLY BIASED

CPB claims that the current structure of federal funding for CPB helps insulate it from politically motivated interference with programming.³⁹ While CPB may have not experienced a great degree of political interference, the public broadcasting community is known by many Americans for its liberal tendencies and is not considered objective or balanced.

³⁰ E-mail from CPB Congressional Liaison, November 4, 2010

³¹ E-mail from Congressional Research Service November 4, 2010

³² http://www.npr.org/about/aboutnpr/statements/fy2009/2009 LA NPR Cons.pdf

http://www.cpb.org/aboutpb/faq/cpbpbsnpr.html

³⁴ E-mail from Congressional Research Service November 3, 2010

³⁵ http://www.npr.org/about/aboutnpr/statements/fy2008/fy08 NPR Inc 990.pdf

http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=111873596
http://www.cpb.org/aboutpb/faq/cpbpbsnpr.html

³⁸ E-mail from Congressional Research Service November 4, 2010

³⁹ http://www.cpb.org/aboutcpb/financials/appropriation/

While the controversy surrounding the firing of political commentator, Juan Williams, has been profiled extensively,⁴⁰ there have been numerous other incidents that have questioned the objectivity of NPR.

CBP's former chairman, Kenneth Tomlinson, in an editorial recollects that he was literally told by public broadcasters that they needed to be funded to "balance" out private media conservative talk show hosts.⁴¹

Ironically, Mr. Tomlinson during his time as chairman attempted to counter what he perceived to be a liberal bias in public television by ensuring programming was offered by PBS to counter a liberal political news commentator program. The program's host not only worked for a Democratic president, but was known for making statements such as that the Bush Administration was "united behind a right-wing agenda" that included "the power of the state to force pregnant women to give up control over their own lives." Mr. Tomlinson's efforts led to his dismissal. 43

The recent comments made by NPR's Vice President for Fundraising that label "Tea Party people" as "seriously racist, racist people," among others further engraved in the public's mind the deep-rooted bias within NPR.

While there are hundreds of similar stories of bias in public radio and television, the goal of Congress or CPB chairmen should not be to ensure 100 percent objectivity of all content aired on public media. Instead, Congress should just let NPR, PBS and similar entities be supported by the people that listen to and appreciate them.

BETTER OFF IN THE LONG RUN

⁴⁰ Mr. Williams was fired because of comments he made on October 18, 1010 on a TV show for stating: "I mean, look, Bill, I'm not a bigot. You know the kind of books I've written about the civil rights movement in this country. But when I get on the plane, I got to tell you, if I see people who are in Muslim garb and I think, you know, they are identifying themselves first and foremost as Muslims, I get worried. I get nervous." NPR released a statement saying that Williams' remarks were "inconsistent" with the organization's "editorial standards and practices, and undermined his credibility as a news analyst with NPR."

⁴¹ http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/OpEd-Contributor/Kenneth-Tomlinson-Why-Congress-must-defund-public-broadcasting-105564033.html

⁴² Labaton, Stephen, and Manly, Lorne, and Jensen, Elizabeth, "Republican Chairman Exerts Pressure on PBS, Alleging Biases," May 2, 2005, New York Times,

 $[\]frac{\text{http://www.nytimes.com/2005/05/02/arts/television/02public.html? } {\text{r=2\&ei=5094\&en=1085de148e09623c\&hp=\&ex=111509}} {2800\&partner=homepage\&pagewanted=print\&position=} \\$

⁴³ Labaton, Stephen, "Broadcast Chief Violated Laws, Inquiry Finds," November 16, 2005, New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/16/politics/16broadcast.html? r=1&pagewanted=print

⁴⁴ http://www.npr.org/2011/03/08/134371393/NPR-Exec-NPR-Would-Be-Better-Off-Without-Fed-Support

NPR has been trending towards becoming a self-sufficient entity. In fact, NPR boasts on its Website, that "We receive no direct federal funding for operations."45 NPR also recently officially changed its name from "National Public Radio" to NPR. 46 While 41 percent of its funding comes from its member stations, 26 percent comes from sponsorships and individual donations such as a recent \$1.8 million donation George Soros⁴⁷ and millions more from major corporations such as General Motors, State Farm, and Prudential.48

For NPR member stations, private individual donations make up more than 32 percent of total revenue. Donations from businesses, universities, and foundations make up an additional 44.4 percent, while direct government subsidies only represent 5.8 percent.⁴⁹

NPR has almost \$426 million in total net assets, with almost \$200 million in unrestricted net assets (i.e. these funds can be spent as NPR wishes).⁵⁰ In FY08, NPR ran an excess budget of more than \$77 million.⁵¹ NPR also has an endowment of more than \$200 million already. 52 As was also recently noted, the last Vice President for fundraising at NPR admitted unknowingly to individuals who were taping his comments that NPR "would be better of in the long run without federal funding."53

Likewise, PBS boasts total net assets of \$279 million and only receives about ten percent of its funding from direct federal appropriations and grants.⁵⁴ Many member stations also have endowment funds and conduct fundraising campaigns and solicit corporate and foundation underwriting for programming.⁵⁵ PBS has even conducted several case studies on how corporate sponsorships of PBS events benefit sponsors, which include Volkswagen, Chik-fil-A, and CVS. 56

⁴⁵ http://www.npr.org/about/aboutnpr/publicradiofinances.html

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/07/AR2010070704578.html

http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/2010/oct/22/gop-puts-npr-chopping-block/?page=1 http://www.npr.org/about/aboutnpr/annualreports/NPRSponsorsDonors08.pdf http://www.npr.org/about/aboutnpr/publicradiofinances.html

⁵⁰ http://www.npr.org/about/aboutnpr/statements/fy2009/2009 LA NPR Cons.pdf

⁵¹ http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=6637

http://www.slate.com/id/2272284/pagenum/all/#p2

http://www.npr.org/2011/03/08/134371393/NPR-Exec-NPR-Would-Be-Better-Off-Without-Fed-Support

http://www.pbs.org/about/media/about/cms_page_media/29/FinancialHighlights2009forWebv8.pdf

http://www.pbs.org/about/support-our-mission/

http://www.sgptv.org/sponsors

CPB is instructed by law to at least appropriate 95 percent of its federal appropriation to support local television and radio stations, programming, and improvements to the public broadcasting system.⁵⁷ In other words, CPB exists to support public media, including PBS and CPB. CPB boasts almost \$93 million in total unrestricted net assets.⁵⁸

While CPB has run a deficit the last couple of years, if Congress were to enact legislation such as H.R. 5538, CPB would have one and a half years before it would not be receiving annual appropriations and the \$93 million in unrestricted assets to close down its operations and allow public radio and television stations to adjust to not receiving CPB grants in the future.

COMPETITION IN THE MEDIA MARKETPLACE

Since CPB was created in 1967, America's media market has changed considerably. Consumers can choose from different media outlets and even different media portals to get their news.

The intent of federally-funded public broadcasting in the Public Broadcasting Act was to make "public telecommunications services available to all citizens of the United States." ⁵⁹

In 2007, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found, "there are 349 public television stations, owned and operated by 173 licensees, which reach 98 percent of the households that have televisions." ⁶⁰

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) found in 2009 that 85 percent of U.S. television households subscribe to cable, satellite or similar multichannel video programming distributor (MVPD) services. ⁶¹ There are at least six major television news stations and numerous smaller ones (not including PBS stations). Every single global major newspaper has online content that can, for the most part, be readily accessed and gives varying perspectives. The creation of satellite radio has also enabled access to several news radio stations for thousands of Americans all over the country. While NPR and PBS (and other public broadcasting services) continue to fill a place within this compilation of various media sources,

60 http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07150.pdf

⁵⁷ http://www.cpb.org/aboutpb/faq/pays.html

http://www.cpb.org/annualreports/2009/images/stories/docs/CPB2009financialsFINAL.pdf

⁵⁹ 47 U.S.C. 396

⁶¹ http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RL34165 20090514.pdf

they are the only major entities that enjoy dedicated annual funding from the federal government.

At no point in our nation's history can Americans access news as easily and from as many different perspectives as today. Through the open sharing of information media organizations have been forced to become more objective and to improve their news coverage.

While PBS and NRP have benefitted from billions in federal funding, they are perfectly capable of standing on their own and enjoy considerable private demand that will enable them to continue without federal funding. In fact, PBS' current president, Paula Kerger, having completed the largest successful endowment campaign ever undertaken by a public television station in her previous position, ⁶² would seem ideally qualified to oversee a transition from federal reliance to non-federal reliance.

Taxpayers Should Not Have to Fund Politically-Charged Media

While there is no doubt that NPR and its member stations and PBS and its members stations are popular with many Americans, it is also clear that NPR does not represent many American taxpayers. Just like other media outlets, these entities are perceived by various groups of Americans differently. The only difference in this case is that NPR and PBS receive considerable federal funding when one takes into account indirect subsidies.

NPR has stated that it is not reliant on federal subsidies any more, and the media market place has also demonstrated that federal taxpayer dollars are not needed to ensure adequate media coverage of news events.

The combination of these two developments should ensure that Congress can cut funding for CPB. In fact, it is likely that such a move will result in a stronger NPR and PBS that is not micromanaged by politicians and their causes and can compete with other media outlets on an equal footing. PBS brags on its website that it brings "more local stories, independent journalism, arts and culture to Americans than any other media enterprise. In addition, PBS is closing the achievement gap in schools and changing the face of classroom learning." Removing federal appropriations will not

63 http://www.pbs.org/about/corporate-information/leadership/pbs-president/

⁶² http://www.pbs.org/about/corporate-information/leadership/pbs-president/bio/

lessen, but increase the "independence" of PBS and, hopefully, increase its effectiveness and popularity.

As our national debt continues to increase, Congress must also prioritize taxpayer funds for only national priorities and needs and find ways to decrease federal spending commitments. Phasing out appropriations for NPR and CPB is a good place to start.

AMENDMENT 217 – SAVE TAXPAYERS \$8 MILLION BY ELIMINATING BRIDGE TOURIST ATTRACTION PROGRAM

<u>OUR HIGHWAY TRUST FUND IS BANKRUPT BECAUSE OF POOR</u> SPENDING DECISIONS

DUPLICATION AMONG PRESERVATION PROGRAMS

OTHER NEEDS COME FIRST

OUR HIGHWAY TRUST FUND IS BANKRUPT BECAUSE OF POOR SPENDING DECISIONS

OBAMA RECOMMENDS CONSOLIDATING THIS PROGRAM

The National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation Program (NHCBP) was established in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century bill (TEA-21) in 1998. This program may only fund bridges listed in the Department of Interior's (DOI) National Register of Historic Places.⁶⁴

The program provides grants to repair or rehabilitate a dozen or so covered bridges each year. About \$500,000 per year is also appropriated for research and technological development to improve covered bridge maintenance. In total \$60.4 million has been appropriated for this program.

Year	Funding
	Amount
1999	\$0
2000	\$8,000,000
2001	\$9,000,000
2002	\$2,800,000
2003	\$6,000,000
2004	\$0
2005	\$0
2006	\$8,600,000
2007	\$9,200,000

⁶⁴ http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/covered.cfm

⁶⁵ http://www.forestprod.org/smallwood10duwadi.pdf

⁶⁶ E-Mail from Congressional Research Service, March 14, 2011

2008	\$8,300,000
2009	\$8,500,000

All Southwest and Northwest states do not have any bridges covered under this program. Over 75 percent of all eligible bridges are in six states: PA, OH, VT, IN, NH, OR.67

According to the executive director of the Historic Bridge Foundation, "While some covered bridges are still in use, others have been bypassed in favor of steel bridges. The covered bridges' main function now is to look scenic and attract tourists."68

DUPLICATION AMONG PRESERVATION PROGRAMS

While this program happens to be administered by the Department of Transportation (DOT) and funded with Highway Trust Fund (HTF) dollars that could be used to repair deficient bridges and highways, there are numerous other federal preservation programs.

For example, DOI oversees multiple, overlapping historic preservation programs. Every federal agency is required to maintain a historic preservation program⁶⁹ and must appoint a historic preservation officer and comply with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The Historic Preservation Fund (which is funded by oil receipts in the outer continental shelf for state and tribal preservation activities as specified in the NHPA)⁷⁰ has about \$80 million in annual appropriations. The Heritage Preservation Services (DOI/NPS) office oversees nine preservation programs, including the Federal Agency Preservation Assistance Program, the Historic Preservation Planning Program, and Technical Preservation Services for Historic Buildings.⁷¹

Even at DOI, President Obama has recommended eliminating two duplicative preservation programs: The Preserve American program⁷² and

⁶⁷ http://www.forestprod.org/smallwood10duwadi.pdf

⁶⁸ Lowy, Joan, New federal budget austerity endangers program aimed at preserving historic covered bridges, Associated Press, March 9, 2011, http://www.startribune.com/nation/117664493.html

⁶⁹ http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/fapa_p.htm 70 http://www.nps.gov/history/HPS/hpg/HPF/index.htm

http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/

http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2011/assets/trs.pdf, , page 48

the Save America's Treasures Program. 73 Both of these programs were recently created to "provide planning funding to support preservation efforts through heritage tourism, education, and historic preservation planning" and to preserve historically significant properties. The President has twice recommended eliminating this program because it has not demonstrated how it contributes to National historic preservation goals and lacks rigorous performance metrics and evaluation efforts.⁷⁴ The President believes these programs should be terminated in a time of difficult trade-offs. 75

In addition to these DOI programs, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation "is an independent federal agency that promotes the preservation, enhancement, and productive use of our nation's historic resources, and advises the President and Congress on national historic preservation policy."⁷⁶

Lastly, Members of Congress have also managed to create a Historic Preservation Tax Credit, which is a 20 or 10 percent tax credit which can be applied to preservation efforts of historic buildings.⁷⁷ This subsidy is expected to total \$400 million in federal funds for FY10 – including \$300 million for corporations – and \$600 million in FY11.⁷⁸

It is questionable why highway dollars are being spent on a historical preservation program in the first place. The fact that there are numerous other federal preservation programs reinforces that this program is not appropriate or necessary.

OTHER NEEDS COME FIRST

The historic Chambers Railroad covered bridge in Cotton Grove, OR, that received a \$1.3 million grant from the National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation Program in FY08⁷⁹ is set to be destroyed and rebuilt as a

bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110 cong senate committee prints&docid=f:45728.pdf#page=392

⁷³ http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/hpg/preserveamerica/

⁷⁴ http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2011/assets/trs.pdf, , page 48

⁷⁵ "Fiscal Year 2012 Terminations, Reductions, and Savings," Office of Management and Budget, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/trs.pdf, Page 64

⁷⁶ http://www.achp.gov/aboutachp.html

⁷⁷ http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/tax/download/HPTI brochure.pdf,

http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nhcbp/090112a.cfm

tourist destination, with better access and historical panels. The city is chipping in less than \$140,000 for the project.⁸⁰

Madison, IA, received \$375,000 through the federal preservation program to install infrared cameras and fire detection equipment on its bridges after arson fires destroyed one bridge and another arson fire nearly destroyed a bridge.

According to a recent *AP* news story, "even the county official in charge of the bridges of Madison County says other needs come first." Todd Hagan, Madison county's engineer and head of the local covered bridge program, said Madison needs federal help keeping its roads paved more than it needs covered bridge aid. Paving expenses, he said, may force Madison to return some roads to gravel.⁸¹

If a recipient of one of these grants can agree that this program does not address national priorities, why can't Congress?

OUR HIGHWAY TRUST FUND IS BANKRUPT BECAUSE OF POOR SPENDING DECISIONS

Congress never bailed out the HTF in its history until 2008. In 2008, Congress passed the first ever HTF bailout of \$8.017 billion transfer from the general funds to the highway account. It was hoped that this amount would be sufficient to get the HTF through the end of the 2005 SAFETEA authorization period, but in 2009, Congress passed another bailout for \$7 billion (H.R. 3357) in July and then in February of 2010, the HIRE Act (H.R. 2847) included a General Fund bailout of \$20 billion. This means that in less than three years, Congress has already transferred \$35 billion to the HTF without changing spending transportation spending levels.

At the same time, Congress has increased appropriations from the HTF on frivolous and unrelated spending. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that \$78 billion in HTF monies was obligated for "purposes

⁸⁰ http://www.kpic.com/news/local/84644932.html

Lowy, Joan, New federal budget austerity endangers program aimed at preserving historic covered bridges, Associated Press, March 9, 2011, http://www.startribune.com/nation/117664493.html

⁸² P.L. 110-318 was enacted September 15, 2008.

⁸³ http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/112xx/doc11230/hr2847.pdf

other than construction and maintenance of highways and bridges" from 2004 to 2008.84

Among these spending priorities were the following:

- \$3.7 billion on transportation enhancement projects like landscaping or bike trails:
- \$224 million on Projects to rehabilitate and operate historic transportation buildings, structures, and facilities;85
- \$28 million to establish 55 transportation museums;⁸⁶
- \$121 million for Ferryboats and Ferry Terminal Facilities.

While politicians are debating increasing federal gas taxes on consumers during a time of economic hardship, they should first ensure that precious highway dollars aren't misspent on tourist attractions that compromise our transportation infrastructure and increase our record-high deficit.

OBAMA RECOMMENDS CONSOLIDATING THIS PROGRAM

President Barack Obama's budget proposal for 2012 would eliminate 55 Department of Transportation programs, including the National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation Program and merge them into five separate accounts. Most projects would still be eligible for highway funding, but would have to compete with other highway and bridge projects for funds.88

Similarly, this amendment wouldn't prohibit federal funding for these historic landmarks, but it would eliminate an entire spending account dedicated to maintaining, rebuilding and developing tourist attractions. If states believe such activity warrants precious transportation dollars they are welcome to make that decision.

⁸⁴ Herr, Phillip, "Highway Trust Fund Expenditures on Purposes Other than construction and Maintenance of highways and Bridges during Fiscal Years 2004-2008," Government Accountability Office, June 30, 2009,

http://coburn.senate.gov/public/_files/OutofGas730Final0.pdf
 http://coburn.senate.gov/public/_files/OutofGas730Final0.pdf

⁸⁷ http://coburn.senate.gov/public/_files/OutofGas730Final0.pdf

⁸⁸ Lowy, Joan, New federal budget austerity endangers program aimed at preserving historic covered bridges, Associated Press, March 9, 2011, http://www.startribune.com/nation/117664493.html

As Isabel Sawhill, an economist with the Brookings Institution, points out, "I love covered bridges, but I don't think it should be a federal responsibility to preserve them."89

Additionally, the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) endorses this amendment its leadership recognizes this program siphons highway dollars from priority transportation projects. 90

Passing this amendment would eliminate about \$8 million in annual appropriations.

⁸⁹ Lowy, Joan, New federal budget austerity endangers program aimed at preserving historic covered bridges, Associated Press, March 9, 2011, http://www.startribune.com/nation/117664493.html
⁹⁰ E-Mail from Oklahoma Department of Transportation, March 14, 2011

AMENDMENT 221 – REDUCES THE COST OF NON-ESSENTIAL NEW VEHICLES PURCHASED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SAVING AT LEAST \$1.8 BILLION

With a \$14.3 trillion dollar debt, the Congress and the Federal government need to spend taxpayer dollars more efficiently and reduce costs during these tough fiscal times.

This proposal would save at least \$1.8 billion by trimming the cost of the federal vehicle fleet.

The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform strongly endorsed reducing the federal vehicle by 20%.

Simply, this amendment will do what most American families are doing on a day to day basis.

The federal government has to learn more with less.

The federal vehicle fleet has grown tremendously over the past five years

There are 662,000 cars,⁹¹ vans, sport-utility vehicles, trucks, buses and ambulances owned or leased by federal agencies. This number included all civilian and non-tactical military vehicles.⁹²

According to the Government Accountability Office, these vehicles consume about a million gallons of fuel per day.

Since 2006, the number of vehicles owned or leased by the federal government has grown by 5% or 32,000.

The average civilian agency vehicle is 5.5 years old and military vehicles are 8 years old.

About 63,794 vehicles were purchased in FY 2010 by government agencies.⁹³

⁹¹ http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports. This is from the 2010 Federal Fleet report.

⁹² http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11318sp.pdf.

Around 35,000 vehicles were purchased by civilian agencies and 25,000 non-tactical vehicles from the military.⁹⁴

The U.S. Government spent \$1.2 billion on purchasing 414 million gallons of fuel used in government vehicles that drove 5.1 billion miles.⁹⁵

This amendment would not prevent any agency from purchasing mission-critical vehicles

Many agencies need vehicles to perform their official government duties.

This amendment allows agencies to exempt vehicle purchases critical for national security reasons.

In 2009, the Air Force demonstrated that agencies can do what this amendment calls for. It was able to reduce its non-tactical vehicle fleet by more than 3,250, without reducing its ability to conduct its mission.⁹⁶

It is unclear why some agencies need many of the vehicles they already own.

For example, why does both the National Science Foundation and Broadcasting Board of Governors need 53 SUVs. 97

Why does the Federal Housing Finance Agency need 6 SUVs and the Small Business Administration need 13 SUVs?⁹⁸

It is essential that every agency purchase and keep only those vehicles they need, and not also those that they merely want.

This amendment would reduce the federal vehicle budget over the next two years by 20 percent

⁹³ http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports

⁹⁴ http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports. This is from the 2010 Federal Fleet report

⁹⁵ http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports

⁹⁶ http://www.gsa.gov/graphics/ogp/FedealFleetReport2009rev.pdf

⁹⁷ http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports

⁹⁸ http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports

In 2010, the federal vehicle budget was \$4.6 billion.

That budget has increased by more than a billion dollars since 2006.99

\$1.8 billion was spent in 2010 for the civilian agencies vehicle fleet; \$1.6 for the U.S. Postal Service and \$1.1 billion for the military. 100

This amendment would reduce the federal vehicle budget in 2011 from \$4.6 billion¹⁰¹ to \$3.6 billion.

The budget would remain at \$3.6 billion for the next two years.

The total savings over two years would be nearly \$1.8 billion.

This amendment would also request each Office of the Inspector General to help find further savings.

The amendment would ask the Inspector General for each federal agency to review the use of their respective agencies vehicles as part of the effort to find further savings.

The Inspector General of each department and agency shall review its respective agencies system for monitoring the use of motor vehicle owned or leased by the Government for non-official use, including a review of the "written authorizations within the agency" to monitor the use of motor vehicles in each agencies fleet, as required under law and report back to congress in six months.

 $^{^{99}~}http://www.gsa.gov/graphics/ogp/FFR2006_030707_R20065S-s_0Z5RDZ-i34K-pR.pdf$

http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports. This is from the 2010 Federal Fleet report

http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102943#<!--010-->Federal Fleet Reports

AMENDMENT 184 -- Identifies, discloses, and describes every federal program.

This amendment would require every federal agency to annually identify and describe each of its programs. The description would include the program's purpose, mission, goals and budget.

This information would provide greater transparency for taxpayers and policy makers.

There are over 2,100 different federal programs.

In his State of the Union speech delivered in January, President Obama pledged to reorganize government to eliminate duplication. He stated:

"We live and do business in the information age, but the last major reorganization of the government happened in the age of black and white TV. There are twelve different agencies that deal with exports. There are at least five different entities that deal with housing policy. Then there's my favorite example: the Interior Department is in charge of salmon while they're in fresh water, but the Commerce Department handles them in when they're in saltwater. And I hear it gets even more complicated once they're smoked. ... In the coming months, *my administration will develop a proposal to merge, consolidate, and reorganize the federal government* in a way that best serves the goal of a more competitive America." [emphasis added]

This amendment will support the President's goal by providing him additional information about each program to make more informed decisions about what programs could be merged, consolidated, and reorganized.

Public Law 111-139 requires the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to identify programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives with duplicative goals and activities and report annually to Congress on the findings, including the cost of such duplication and with recommendations for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication.

Just this month, the Government Accountability Office GAO issued its first report mandated by this law which found widespread overlap and duplication within 34 areas examined and concluded the federal government could save hundreds of billions of dollars by eliminating duplication and overlap.

The information provided by this amendment would assist GAO's ongoing efforts by providing comparable data from every agency and recommendations from the agency's administrators on how to best address duplication and overlap.

This information will also allow Congress to improve oversight efforts and make more informed decisions about seemingly unmet needs. Often well intentioned legislation rushed into law duplicates the efforts of an existing program. This will allow Congress to check the lists of programs that already exist to determine if the best approach to a problem is a new initiative or updating an outdated or failing program that already exists.

All of these actions benefit taxpayers by increasing accountability and transparency of how the federal government is spending money, reducing and preventing duplication and overlap, and providing greater access to information about government programs and federal assistance.

The amendment will not direct agencies to do much more than already required to comply with the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95-220), which established the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

The current law requires a listing of all domestic assistance programs.

This amendment would apply to <u>all</u> programs, including foreign assistance or programs that apply solely to federal initiatives, such as food safety programs or information technology (IT) programs. These types of programs do not necessarily provide grants or assistance to states, businesses or individuals, but are government programs nonetheless.

Enactment of this amendment would ensure a complete and total listing of all government programs.

This bi-partisan amendment is co-sponsored by Senators Susan Collins (R-ME) and Claire McCaskill (D-MO).